



**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD  
UNIVERSITY PARK MARRIOTT  
CANYON B CONFERENCE ROOM  
TUCSON, ARIZONA  
JUNE 22, 2011  
MINUTES**

**Board Members Present**

Tracey Westerhausen, Chairman (arrived at 1:13pm); Walter Armer, Vice-Chairman; Alan Everett; William Scalzo; Maria Baier; Larry Landry.

**Board Members Absent**

Reese Woodling

**Staff Members Present**

Renée Bahl, Executive Director; Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks; Kent Ennis, Assistant Director, Administration; Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, External Affairs and Partnerships; Monica Enriquez, Executive Staff Assistant.

**Attorney General's Office**

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

**AGENDA**

**(Agenda items may be taken in any order unless set for a time certain)**

**A. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL – Time Certain: 1:00 PM**

Mr. Armer called the meeting to order at 1:05pm. Roll call indicated a quorum was present.

**B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mr. Armer led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

**C. INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF**

- 1. Board Statement - “As Board members we are gathered today to be the stewards and voice of Arizona State Parks and its Mission Statement to manage and conserve Arizona’s natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our parks and through our partners.”**

Mr. Scalzo read the Board Statement. The Board and Staff introduced themselves.

**D. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – Consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Board must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or reschedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.**

Bill Meek, President, Arizona State Parks Foundation said he would comment on the June 22, 2011 Agenda Items G1 and G2 and on the June 23, 2011 Agenda Items 8a and 8b. He said in last May’s Arizona State Parks Foundation newsletter, he stated that Arizona State Parks could not endure its current level of financial starvation for more



than another year or two. He said in that newsletter he outlined an agenda for three critical changes that must be accomplished by 2012. 1) ASP must permanently protect the Parks systems earned income from legislative appropriation. 2) ASP must secure a protected source of income to pay for core operations, major maintenance and capital improvement. 3) ASP must be able to take full advantage of partnership opportunities with private enterprise and non-profit entities. That would require administrative flexibility and financial integrity. He said he thought the best way to implement these changes was to transfer parks function to a parks district or some other quasi governmental entity as suggested by the consultants who authored the Foundation's study on privatization. He said for any of these changes to be effective they would have to be protected. This would mean a referendum or initiative measure on the ballot in 2012. In order for that to happen ASP would need to have the preferred solution in bill form ready by the end of the summer. That would mean working immediately to analyze and weigh the financial, legal and political considerations involved in the alternative. The alternatives should be looked at by a cross section of stakeholders including but not limited to parks and recreation professionals, business people especially the tourism industry, historic preservation, and outdoor enthusiasts. The Foundation had hoped the Governor might appoint a committee or task force to shepherd this process but the Governor's Office has no appetite for that. The Foundation's Executive Committee has recommended strongly to its Board to support this effort. He believed they would at its July 14, 2011 meeting. He requested to the Parks Board to contribute to this effort by appointing two or three members to the Foundation's Task Force. He said the Foundation's study on privatization has drawn national attention since Arizona is the poster child for parks funding problems nationwide. He said he, Ms. Bahl and Cristie Statler, Executive Director, of the Arizona State Parks Foundation will be attending the conference. He said he hoped he would find support in July at the conference.

Mr. Landry said he agreed with Mr. Meek on his first two points. He said a permanent, voter protected funding source is the fundamental root of the problems. The issue with ASP is not government or legislative flexibility. He noted that the Governor does not appoint ASP's Executive Director and therefore that position is non-political. He said unless the Foundation could show the Board proof that an Authority model might work better than how ASP currently works it should not be sought. He said he thought governance was not the issue; funding is the issue – how to get it and how to make it permanent. He said there are at least four groups that are looking at various initiatives for wildlife, open space, parks, area and arts and culture. He hoped that those groups somehow come together and are not competing silos for money but a coordinated effort. Mr. Meek said it should be done by September or it will not happen.

## **E. THE STATE OF ARIZONA STATE PARKS**

Ms. Bahl said the state of Arizona State Parks presentation compares the status of the agency in FY 2012 (the upcoming fiscal year) compared to FY 2008. It will show how ASP is different, what has been accomplished and what needs to be done to move forward. The presentation is attached to these minutes as Attachment A.



Mr. Armer asked if there had been complaints about the reservation system. Ms. Bahl said there had been a few complaints on the reservation system. She said some people liked the idea of stopping by. There have not been complaints about the operation of the reservation system but they complaints about the fact that ASP is making the campground too crowded now and they may not get the desired spot now.

## **F. BUDGET PRESENTATION**

### **1. Staff will provide a presentation regarding:**

#### **a. FY 2012 Operating Budget and Assumptions**

Mr. Ennis said the FY 2012 budget begins on July 1, 2011. He said the Legislature gave agencies their budgets earlier in the year and it set the groundwork for ASP's appropriated funds. He said he would mostly talk about the unappropriated funds which are the ones the Board has the most influence over. He said the goal for FY 2012 is to keep operating budgets flat. That is little change from FY 2011. Mr. Landry asked if there are directions from the Governor's Office that you have to do that or could ASP ask for what it needs. Ms. Bahl said agency's could ask for what they want. Mr. Landry asked if there were guidelines that ASP could not ask for more money. Ms. Bahl answered that the Governor's Office distributes guidelines to the agency not to ask for an increase but the Parks Board could ask for an increase. Mr. Landry asked if staff had information or a wish list of what ASP could do if there was more money. He said if the Parks Board could adopt a budget that was more driving as opposed to surviving. Ms. Bahl answered that staff does not have that information with them. Mr. Landry asked when staff had to present the budget to the Governor's Office. Mr. Ennis answered September 1, 2011. Mr. Landry noted that is before the next scheduled Board meeting. Mr. Landry said in that case the Board would have to act at this meeting or have a special meeting prior to September 1, 2011. Ms. Bahl answered affirmatively.

Mr. Ennis explained the definitions of budget terms and funds. The terms and definitions were part of the presentation and are included in these minutes as Attachment B. He said only 50% of the Land Conservation Fund could be spent in any one year to a single county. Mr. Landry asked what cities had applied for the Growing Smarter Grants. Mr. Ennis answered City of Scottsdale, City of Phoenix, and possibly Coconino County. He said because of that 50% ASP's estimation is that the balance will decline by 50% each year. Ms. Bahl clarified that it is no more than 50% of the available monies to cities or a county in the same county. For instance, Phoenix and Scottsdale apply because they are both in Maricopa County and they couldn't together get more than 50% but Coconino County or another county could apply and the money could be spent down. Mr. Scalzo asked if the actual spending of the funds is deferred until after ASP receives the grant application and reviewed by the Conservation Acquisition Board (CAB). Ms. Bahl answered affirmatively. Mr. Scalzo asked what the timeline is as to when it would hit ASP's budget. Mr. Ziemann answered the timeline is up to the Land Commissioner but it generally goes out after the auction. Ms. Baier said there is a certain amount of due diligence that has to take place but the goal is to get the money out as soon as possible. Mr. Scalzo asked what balance is ASP able to expend out of that balance and



for how long. Mr. Ziemann said the cities and counties try to do the due diligence ahead of time so that so the Board is better able to evaluate the grants.

Mr. Ennis said about 33% of money from the Enhancement Fund from FY 2008-FY 2011 has been swept. He said in FY 2011, 21% of the Enhancement Fund was swept. Mr. Landry said the Enhancement Fund is the gate fees, concession fees and camping fees and is the money that ASP earns. He said if someone goes to a park and pays \$10 to get in then the Legislature re-allocates \$2.10 of that \$10 to other parts of State Government. Ms. Bahl said in FY 2011 that is correct. Mr. Landry said, in other words, ASP's users are paying a fee and part of that fee is going, not to protect the Parks, ASP's capital or staffing, but it is going to other state government. Mr. Ennis answered affirmatively.

Mr. Ennis said the amount in total agency available agency funds has been declining each year. He said the State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF) has been particularly hard hit. He said there have also been significant reductions to the Enhancement Fund. The Heritage Fund has had the biggest hit because it is now permanently gone but up to FY 2011, the Heritage Fund had been swept by \$26 million. He said the total that has been swept over FY 2008-FY 2011 is \$81.7 million.

Mr. Ennis said from FY 2008 to the estimated FY 2013 there has been mostly a decline in the appropriated funds but non-appropriated funds have been swept as well. He said this has reduced ASP's total funding from about \$76 million in total revenue to about \$25 million in FY 2012.

Mr. Ennis said that the parks are now split up in different categories by how they are managed. The categories are: parks that ASP operates, parks that ASP operates with partnership support, parks that have been transferred to other operating partners, and two parks are closed. The ones that have are managed by a partnership or were transferred show a declining trend in attendance.

Mr. Ennis said there was low attendance in May. He said year-to-date attendance is down 11% while overall gate revenues are up about 3.5%. Mr. Everett asked if there is any explanation why the drop in attendance. Mr. Ennis said some guesses were gas prices. Ms. Bahl said the other thing that has happened is that with the new reservation system the money comes in when they make the reservation even if it is two months in advance. She said for the next 12 months it might look a little different month-to-month. Mr. Scalzo said he thought the impact of the fires in perception rather than reality will have an effect on both southeast and northeastern parks. Ms. Bahl answered affirmatively.

Mr. Ennis said the Law Enforcement Boating Safety Fund (LEBSF) and the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund would have the same revenue forecast in FY 2012 but with different monthly patterns. He said the SLIF would have about the same revenue and revenue pattern expectation in FY 2012. The interest earnings would continue to decline in FY 2012. Mr. Ziemann noted that in the past the grant funds would stay in the ASP fund for three years because grantees would do the work and then the work was reimbursed. He said that is one reason why the interest earnings were previously so



high but now that the grants program has been obliterated there are no balances to carry forward.

Mr. Ennis said the most important assumptions for FY 2012 is that ASP would keep as many parks open and operating as possible, there would not be more legislative sweeps in FY 2012 and ASP would expend the one-year authority to use the LEBSF above the legislated \$750,000 in grants. These assumptions and the Board policy considerations are included in the minutes as Attachment C.

Mr. Armer noted that the assumption for continued local financial support agreements to support park operations would be solid in FY 2012 but it probably would not be in FY 2013.

Mr. Landry said the Board has a duty of care. He said that means the Board does not have to worry about balancing the state budget. That is beyond the decision making of the Board. He said he would like to explore that the Board ask for a budget that reflects the needs ASP really has. He said ASP has been fighting defense in struggling for the last several years hoping to break even. The damages have been minimized. That is a defensive victory. He said he would rather have an offensive defeat where the Board says this is what is needed and is a reasonable request even with capital included. He said there is over \$200 million in capital needs. Even if ASP does not get what is asked the Board is, at least, setting the bar and honestly communicating a budget request that is realistic with is needed.

Chairman Westerhausen asked what pitfall would ASP then face with the legislature if ASP was the only agency to circulate what is wanted as a real budget. Mr. Landry said the Game and Fish Department asks for what they need as does the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). He said the end result is immaterial but it is the Board's duty to say what is realistically needed. He said if the Board does not tell ASP's story nobody else will.

Mr. Everett asked what would be the downside to that approach. Ms. Bahl said the construct of the budget request through the Governor's Office and Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) doesn't allow that because you have to type in numbers and it is submitted electronically and there is no room for discussion. She said the real question would be would the legislature ever see the request because it would go to the Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting (OSPB).

Mr. Landry added that it could be explained to the OSPB and JLBC in informal discussions with their analysts.

Mr. Scalzo asked staff if there is a requirement when asking for increased expenditures to also identify potential resources. Mr. Ennis answered affirmatively. He said agencies must submit a balanced budget and a spending plan. Ms. Bahl asked if it could be requested from the General Fund or did it have to be one of ASP's existing funds. Mr. Ennis said an increase out of the General Fund could be requested. Mr. Landry said he wanted to distinguish between the Board and staff. He said the Board could say fund ASP the equivalent of the Heritage Fund. Those are Lottery funds that is not allocating a new tax. Mr. Armer said if the Board decided to ask for money then capital improvement funding should be included in the ask. This might be weigh a little more



credibility with some rural legislators who have these facilities in their backyards. Ms. Bahl said there is Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) money for this year and there should be an allocation next year but ASP does not have the match. ASP could request the match amount.

Mr. Landry said he would like to see by tomorrow staff recommendations if the Board was to vote on what is needed. He said he would like at least one Board member to know the numbers and understand them. Mr. Scalzo asked Mr. Landry if he was talking about the practical projects that could be completed in that time period. He said the "shovel ready" projects. Mr. Landry answered not necessarily. He said he would like to see the numbers to at least have a frame and then it could be decided as a policy whether or not the Board wants to ask for the money. He said the Board could pass a motion today with this philosophy and with these understandings and let staff work out the details of it. He said the motion could be made with enough flexibility that staff could fine tune it but he would like the numbers to begin.

Chairman Westerhausen asked if there would be a motion at the June 23, 2011 meeting, should the Board discuss how the motion would be worded. Ms. Bahl said the Board and staff could talk in general terms but it would help staff to know what the Board is thinking more specifically. Mr. Landry said the Board could give direction what to ask for as a Board policy but he does not want to vote on "just a piece of the pie." He wants to know what "the pie is." He said the Board did not have enough information to make that decision. Once the Board has the information then a motion could be appropriate.

Mr. Ennis said the Parks Board had decided by consensus that there would not be travel reimbursements for Parks Board members and Advisory Committee members. Mr. Scalzo said the Board should make that perfectly clear as a policy that there would not be any travel reimbursements. He said the Board should not discuss it much just take appropriate action.

Mr. Ennis said the FY 2012 operating budget is \$19.5 million. The entire grant package is \$46 million and \$40 million is coming out of the Growing Smarter Fund. He said ASP has 11 sources of funds that feed into \$19.5 million operating budget. 31% of the budget is the SLIF and 47% of the budget is the Enhancement Fund. He said the rest are quite small operations. The LEBSF, after the grants to the designated counties, would be 6%. He said ASP's operating expenditures are broken down into personal services (\$8.62 million), employee related expenses (\$3.85 million) and other operating (\$7.01 million). The other operating expenses is everything else including computers, rent, minor equipment repair. The personal services expense for FY 2012 would be \$12.47 million and that figure is down compared to FY 2009 when the personal services were \$19.5 million, declining almost 38%.

Mr. Scalzo asked if the Employee Related Expenses were mandated by state contract and so the Board has no control over these expenses. Mr. Ennis answered affirmatively.

Mr. Ennis said the expenditures by program are categorized by division. The Parks division is the highest at \$13.78, Partnerships is \$1.78 million and Administration is said \$3.92 million. He said administration includes computer operations, risk management,





marketing and Phoenix rent. Mr. Scalzo said asked where utilities are listed. He said that should be listed because people understand that. Mr. Ennis said that Phoenix utilities are included in Administration but Park utilities are included in Parks. Mr. Scalzo asked if ASP pays rent for any building it is in. Mr. Ennis answered affirmatively.

Mr. Ennis said in terms of total revenue including federal funds it is estimated to be at \$25.18 million in FY 2012. Mr. Scalzo asked if there would be a match for the LWCF. Ms. Bahl said not right now. She said staff are recommending in FY 2013 a small amount of SLIF money set aside for capital purposes but the Board has not selected a project. Mr. Scalzo said that is a good one to ask money for because it means ASP could expend federal funds similar to AHCCCS and other federal funds where ASP must provide a match so it is understandable to budget people.

#### **b. FY 2013 Proposed Operating Budget Request and Assumptions**

Mr. Ennis said in terms of the FY 2013 request to the Board it would reflect in the Budget Request to OSPB and JLBC. It is only slightly higher than FY 2012 at \$19.6 million. The FY 2013 Operating Budget Request is included in the minutes as Attachment D.

#### **c. FY 2012 Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund Allocations**

Mr. Ziemann said the discussion of the Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Recreation Fund Allocations are being discussed with the budget because one of the recommendations is for website enhancement which would be contract employment. A person or company would be contracted to update the OHV website and make it comprehensive. He said that is the link to ASP's actual operating budget. The Board would take action on the other agenda items concerning OHV at the June 23, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Ziemann said in conversations with the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) they have stated they would like the website to have links and a lot more information. The current OHV website exists within the azstateparks.com website. The OHVAG said they were interested in changing the domain name and that would be included in the \$50,000. The contract employee would be a computer tech type of person. That person would put all of that information in a form that ASP's webmaster could easily dump that information into the existing OHV website. It would make it a one-stop shop for OHV issues throughout the state. He said staff recommended an expenditure of \$50,000 and the OHVAG unanimously concurred at its May 20, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Ziemann said the following are now more of the grant program and do not have to do with the operating budget. He said about three or four years ago the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) began the Ambassador Program on their land. They would run events in conjunction with other agencies including ASP, Game and Fish Department and the Forest Service. These events are run by a collection of volunteers and they do a number of different educational programs where they interact with the public. These include taking youth out and showing them how to ride, spread the message of how to ride responsibly and staying on the trails. There are also some classroom activities. The BLM's Ambassador Program has won all kinds of awards. It is a model project for responsible OHV use. Last year, the Parks Board allocated \$110,000 for the BLM



portion of the Ambassador program. This year staff is recommending expending up to \$163,800 to expand the program further with BLM. He said the OHVAG has recommended the amount stay at \$110,000.

Mr. Everett asked what the extra money that staff is recommending would be used for. Mr. Ziemann answered more educational programs such as the ones described earlier and to have additional resources on the ground. Mr. Scalzo noted that this is an education program that benefits everybody including county, regional, State Land Department, ranchers, etc. It is not just BLM.

Mr. Ziemann said the Ambassador program has been so wildly successful that last year the Parks Board set aside \$75,000 of OHV funds to run Ambassador programs on lands managed by agencies other than the BLM. It could have been on the State Land Department's properties but most of the money is spent on working with the Forest Service especially up in Coconino County. He said there were different events sponsored by different land managers and because there are more of those managers and the Forest Service especially seem anxious to do these kinds of events, staff recommended to expand this to \$166,300 for this coming year. OHVAG recommended to not fund this at all.

Mr. Armer asked why the OHVAG has made this recommendation. Mr. Ziemann answered that his sense from the discussion was that there were some concerns that members of the OHVAG had with various land managers. Mr. Landry asked what the OHVAG wanted the money to be used for. Mr. Ziemann said that the OHVAG preferred the money to be spent on the next item.

Mr. Ziemann said the remainder of the money that is generated in revenue and is available in FY 2012 would be available for grant projects. He said the project money is used to do some law enforcement but mostly to enhance and mitigate damage, enhance trails and distribute information on responsible riding and where riding should take place. Mr. Scalzo said the Ambassador program's grants do all that. There is education and it benefits its counties, regional facilities, etc. He said some trail riders cause damage and some of that is because of a lack of understanding, lack of education or they cannot differentiate the lands. He said programs such as this could help it happen. He said he doesn't understand why off road people would not want people better educated especially in areas where there are problems. The problems could be mitigated and get the general public more positive rather than negative about them. He said he thought the \$166,000 is the wisest money that ASP could spend. He said fewer signs might be needed to educate people where to go. There would always be problems but he liked the idea of training and education and at least make it fun.

Mr. Ziemann said the most important thing is that it is obvious that there is an OHV problem. There are young people getting hurt, people riding irresponsibly, dust problems. That is why these funds are available. He said rather than run a traditional grant program where once a year ASP would go out to grant them. The Board has established a policy to set up expenditures up to these amounts and staff goes out and contracts and solicits three or four times per year. Requests are made constantly and as long as the projects meet the statutory and priorities established in the State Trails





Plan that the Parks Board adopted these are funded and the money is out there on the ground. He said this is critically important. He said ASP does not have the staff to go out and run these programs. ASP must rely on others to do that. Ultimately ASP would be reactive to the grantees request.

Ms. Baier said she agreed with Mr. Scalzo. She said the return on investment for education is cost effective.

Mr. Landry concurred and said a little prevention has incredible return on investment.

Mr. Armer said the more people that are educated and become conscientious about what they are doing then become the eyes on the ground that the State Land Department or other land managers don't have the resources to hire.

Chairman Westerhausen said she wanted to discuss the perspective of the OHVAG. She said the OHVAG perceives the decal fee as being OHVAG's money. She said the Board should have someone, possibly from the Attorney General's office, explain that legally it is not OHVAG's money. Because the OHVAG believe it is their money, they don't understand why, what they consider to be modest requests for travel reimbursement, isn't honored. They feel that they are in a different category from the other advisory committees because the OHVAG has this revenue stream that is theirs. She said the other thing that may account for why the OHVAG didn't want to expand the OHV Ambassador program is that the OHVAG believe that \$75,000 issue where they declined to give the money to grantees and then staff bought trailers.

Ms. Hernbrode said her impression about the OHVAG was that they felt they were influential in getting the legislation passed and because they are a subset of the general public by paying the OHV decal fee and that is what they felt gave them ownership to the money. She said she didn't think the OHVAG understand how the statute actually works.

Mr. Landry said he thought the Board should be very clear that they get all of the recommendations and staff does not filter them or not present them. He said the OHVAG is saying that staff is not giving the Board the information and that is blatantly false. He suggested Chairman Westerhausen, working with staff, answer that point. He noted the Board asks staff and the advisory committees for their recommendations. It is the Board's duty to make the decision.

Mr. Scalzo said on the issue of OHV projects that it is difficult because ASP is working with federal agencies and their process is difficult. He said many of the local agencies' land is owned by federal agencies so for the most part only federal agencies would apply for these grants.

Mr. Ziemann said Mr. Scalzo makes a good point. That is why staff wants flexibility so that when ASP gets the go ahead from these land managers that ASP wants to move forward and does not want to wait until another cycle is open.

Chairman Westerhausen said that the OHVAG feels their recommendation should be on the agenda and not buried in the packet. She does not want to characterize them as blatantly false. She would hope the OHVAG and the Board and staff would not use language such as that.



**d. FY 2012 State Historic Preservation Office Work Plan**

Mr. Ziemann said the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Work Plan is in ASP's budget each year but does not change much. It is merely a litany of the things that they do. Before the federal government would allow the money to come to operate the SHPO says the administering body must approve the work plan. The Board's approval of what the SHPO do on a day-to-day basis allows ASP to get the federal portion to run the SHPO.

**e. FY 2012 and FY 2013 Capital Improvement Plan**

Mr. Ream said the Capital Improvement Plan is required by the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA). He said ASP has \$150 million in capital needs. The two plans for FY 2012 and FY 2013 identify about \$20 million of that \$150 million in capital needs. He said the FY 2012 allocates \$0 for capital improvement projects.

Mr. Scalzo said the Board could ask for some resources to be put in that such as LWCF matching local partners grants to do capital projects that could enhance ASP's revenue or help in areas where there is safety issues.

Mr. Landry said he would like to consider adding the House of Apache Fire at Red Rock State Park to the list. He would like to know what it would take to get that open. He said the House of Apache Fire would be an international tourist draw. He said he didn't know what it would cost to open it but he would like it on the wish list.

Ms. Bahl said ASP has not spent many resources on assessing the House of Apache Fire. She said it is in bad condition right now. The first step would be to have someone come in to do an assessment and design to see if it could be stabilized or not. She said she would recommend adding the due diligence in year one to get the recommendation. Then there would be a dollar amount and what they would do with it for probably two years after that. Chairman Westerhausen asked if that would include an evaluation to access to the House. Ms. Bahl answered that all of that would be included.

**2. Staff will provide a presentation on the Arizona State Parks Board approved Agency Strategic Plan and Revised FY 2012 and FY 2013 Strategic Plan to the Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting (OSPB).**

Mr. Ziemann said at the last Board meeting on May 11, 2011, he gave the Board the updated strategic plan. He said a handout with updated on all the work that has been done by staff. He said now the Board has a handout (included in these minutes as Attachment E) with more updates up to April 30, 2011. He explained the updates are changes to the performance measures. They are for the Board's view but the Board would not take action on these. At the June 23, 2011, the Board would take action to change three words in the language of the objectives. Ms. Bahl said the language clarifies the objective but doesn't change the intent.

Mr. Ziemann said the Governor's OSPB asks agencies each year to submit a strategic plan. They have their own template and their own form. Staff has not received that format from OSPB yet for this year. He said would do with the Board's consent is take the current strategic plan and fit it into their format.



## **G. Priorities and Potential Solutions**

Ms. Bahl said there are two main topics under this heading. One is sustainable funding and the other is legislative priorities. The legislative priorities could be big picture priorities or any other smaller changes. It may link to the budget request for FY 2013.

### **1. Discussion on Priorities and Potential Solutions for Sustainable Funding**

Mr. Landry said he thought the chance of the State Legislature referring anything to the ballot on sustainable funding for State Park is less than one tenth of one percent. He said there needs to be a sustainable funding source in a ballot proposition. He said he had mentioned earlier several groups that are working on initiatives. He said he had been looking for ways those initiatives could be complimentary and not competitive. He said the Board should be collectively involved in those discussions. ASP wants a sustainable, non-sweep able, protected funding source for ASP. He said this is not just operating but also capital. He said if there are going to be ballot initiatives then compelling properties should be examined.

Mr. Scalzo said ASP should build a larger base of support that would include a variety of agencies including Tourism, cities and county organizations that ASP could partner with in creating a greater mass. That way when ASP goes to the Legislature and giving them a clear message that is defined early in rather than wait until it is too late. He said if the Parks Foundation could do that then ASP could find a way to participate with them. Some members of the Board should volunteer to keep that momentum going. He said time is against us and ASP cannot go every year and try to sustain a major park system. As soon as possible, the Board members should meet with other potential partners that have manageable or clear benefits that ASP could show to the public. He said Tourism, cities and counties are the key elements to starting that process. If the Parks Foundation could get it going, then the Board could take advantage of it.

Mr. Armer said he agreed with everything that had been said but he thought it cost a lot of money to get an initiative.

Mr. Landry said there are groups that would have the resources to get something on the ballot. He said ASP needs a communication plan, a 60-second sound bite and message discipline. He said ASP needs to stress the return on investment. He said message discipline equals credibility. He said ASP needs to have an advocacy plan that augments what is already there.

Ms. Bahl clarified what the Board had said. She said what she heard them say was a communications plan, message discipline, 60-second sound bite and a legislative advocacy plan. Mr. Landry said in the Indian Gaming compacts of the state shared revenue 12 percent has to go to cities or towns or state or non-profit agencies through them. Mr. Scalzo asked if it is a grant program. Mr. Landry answered affirmatively.

Chairman Westerhausen said everything that is being talked about with the quality of life issue could also be accomplished with the quasi-governmental agency issue. However, the Legislature will not give that to ASP funding would have to be found. Because of that, ASP might be better going with quality of life because there would be more people to get signatures.



Ms. Baier said it is important to do the outreach to find if somebody else is doing a similar initiative that would erode your base support. She said there is an effort to reform the management of State Trust Land. Some of the most significant conservation agencies are engaged in those discussions. She said it is important to coordinate with those groups and find what funding needs are unmet in those issues. She said the Board should think about how to get constituencies that add to your own constituency involved and interested in the initiative.

Mr. Landry said maybe some Board members could volunteer to work with staff on a more detailed plan for sustainable funding that could come back at the next Board meeting for discussion. He said he thought several Board members had different ideas. It might be better than to try to write the plan in this forum. A detailed action plan could be developed including a launch strategy, communication plan. He said he thought the Board could work with staff to help and then bring it back to the Board in September for further discussion.

Chairman Westerhausen said to add to the list getting more fans in Pima and Maricopa Counties.

## **2. Discussion on Legislative Issues, Priorities and Potential Solutions for Upcoming Legislative Sessions**

Chairman Westerhausen said the Board needed to clarify for staff what the ideal budget would mean.

Mr. Landry said if there were not any budget constraints what budget would staff feel comfortable asking for including not only operating but also capital. He said staff would then have to identify, under the Governor's guidelines, potential funding sources. He thought that was a separate discussion. He said he didn't expect exact numbers from staff. Ballpark figures are good enough for this discussion to give direction. Once the Board has the information, they could decide how much, if any, they would like to adopt. He would like capital projects to include design, engineering and assessment. He said on operating, where ideally should ASP be.

Ms. Bahl answered that staff would do their best and if the information would not satisfy the Board then there could be another Board meeting scheduled before September. She asked the Board to pass the FY 2012 budget because that is done and this discussion would be for the FY 2013 budget request. She said staff had put together an ideal budget for the Governor's Sustainable State Parks Task Force and that budget was \$40-44 million and included \$10 million for maintenance but not capital and it didn't account for any expansion of the system.

Mr. Scalzo said he heard Speaker Tobin on a talk show and the Speaker said ASP needed capital money and he suggested there was money through the Growing Smarter Fund. The interviewer asked him if that was possible and the Speaker said he thought it was. Mr. Scalzo said if the Speaker said that then ASP should pursue that methodology to get some legislation for a capital fund for ASP to take on major issues that have already been identified that would 1) make the parks safer and more friendly to the public and 2) would produce more revenue. Those could come through a variety of campsites, facilities ASP does not currently have or to make Tonto Natural Bridge a



bed and breakfast and make it effective. There are viable projects such as Contact Point that need to be moved on and if the Speaker said this on a TV show then it is in his mind. The Board should take advantage of this before it is too late. He said he would like to make that a legislative priority. He said the Speaker talked \$20 million.

Mr. Landry said the Board needed to work with its various partners and have a legislative day at the capitol. The Board could use mayors, have appointments with key legislators and use the Friends groups. He hoped the Board could take action during this meeting to work to book a date with the Parks Foundation before the Legislature decides on a budget. He said ASP needs champions in the House. He thought the Board should identify champions in the Legislature, educate them and let them be ASP's messengers.

Chairman Westerhausen asked Mr. Landry if he envisioned the Legislative Day to take place of what Chairman Westerhausen, Ms. Bahl and Mr. Ziemann did last legislative session which was to meet with the legislators one-on-one. Mr. Landry said he thought it should be both.

Mr. Scalzo said he thought the Board should identify other potential existing resources that ASP might be able to tap into for these resources that ASP has. He noted he is always anxious to get some of the mining resource money and the new energy resource money from solar. ASP needs to take identifiable resources that are there now and not ask for all of it but some piece of it to help regenerate the parks system. He said he thought ASP should look at the kind of dollars that already come in and identify small portions of those.

Mr. Armer said in the Tucson area Rosemont is spending a lot of money to sell their mine. He said he does have some contacts there.

Mr. Scalzo said the thought the Board should talk to some of the mining folks if they are doing something why shouldn't ASP be part of that.

Mr. Scalzo asked about the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) money. He said ASP does not get what it needs improve roads, better access at the parks it could improve the whole system. He said why not make a stronger push to get the up to \$5 million they could give ASP each year.

Mr. Scalzo asked if that was legislative or negotiation. Ms. Bahl answered negotiation. Mr. Scalzo answered who negotiates. Ms. Bahl answered herself and a Board member.

Mr. Landry said the history is that in 1985 the legislation read "\$5 million each year." In 1996 it was changed to read "up to \$5 million each year." He said they haven't funded ASP for a couple of years. Mr. Landry noted that he and Mr. Everett know some Board members and they could meet with them.

Ms. Bahl said she has the history and she would talk to Director Halikowski. Mr. Scalzo asked staff if there is a list of Board members to please give the list to the Board.

Ms. Baier said when thinking of funding sources there should be some thought as to who the opposition is going to be. She thought some of them are non-starters. She said as far as mining it is a tough opponent.





Mr. Landry said he agreed with Ms. Baier. He thought the Board should figure out the best targets of opportunities and focus on those.

Ms. Bahl asked Mr. Scalzo if he wanted to add the gas tax to the list. Mr. Scalzo answered affirmatively. Mr. Landry said the gas tax is the last thing people would support in Arizona. Ms. Baier said the President would come out against it.

Ms. Bahl said she would ask the Board to consider a legislative strategy to protect the Enhancement Fund. This is because the BLM has said that in order for ASP to work with private operators on BLM patent and lease land the money must stay with ASP.

Chairman Westerhausen how would the Board accomplish that. Ms. Bahl answered that the Board would have to identify and cultivate State Park champions.

Ms. Bahl noted she did not know how to protect a fund that is not voter protected.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the legislature voted and the Governor signed a bill this past legislative session to protect the Donations Fund. Although it is protected it could still be swept. Mr. Scalzo said what brought that on was the embarrassment of it. He said if they swept the money a sign could be put up in the parks saying so.

Mr. Landry said that a sign could say that 21 cents out of every dollar last year was taken from ASP and went to other forms of State government.

Ms. Bahl said in contracts with third parties there could be a sentence that says if funds are swept or diverted the contract would be cancelled.

## H. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Armer motioned to adjourn. Mr. Scalzo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously at 4:54 pm.

\*\*\*\*\*

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the acting ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Tracey Westerhausen, Chairman

Renée E. Bahl, Executive Director

8/5/11 1:52 PM

**STATE OF  
ARIZONA STATE PARKS**

## FY 2008 – What We Had

---

• 29 State Parks Open and Operated by ASP		
• 2.5 million visitors		
• 328 Full-time filled positions in March 2008		
• Grant Programs: LEBSF, Federal Grants Heritage Fund, SLIF, Off-Highway Vehicle Fund, Land Conservation Fund		\$42.0 M*
• State Parks Operating Budget		\$26.3 M
General Fund	\$7.7 M	
Enhancement (Gate Fees)	\$9.2 M	
• State Parks Capital		\$8.6 M
<b>Total Revenue</b>		<b>\$76.9 M</b>

## FY 2012 – Where We Are

---

- 27 State Parks OPEN: 19 agreements, 6 operated by other entities; 4 operating on reduced schedules
- 2.2 million visitors
- 205 Full-time filled positions
- Grant Programs: LEBSF, Federal Grants
  - Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund \$ 5.5 M
- State Parks Operating Budget
  - General Fund \$ 0 M
  - Enhancement (Gate Fees) \$10.0 M
- State Parks Capital \$ 0
- Total Revenue \$ 24.9 M**

## FY 2012 - What is Missing

---

- \$56.5 M annually in operating, capital, grants
- Statewide planning, environmental education, robust research and marketing
- Capital and maintenance funding
- Park Rangers at every State Park
- Grant programs including the Heritage Fund
- Operating most State Historic Parks
- Staffing depth



# What We Gained

---

New, more meaningful partnerships

- Financial

2008 - \$0      2012 - \$600,000

- Operating / Management

- In Kind

- Marketing

- Fund Raising

- Tribes, Federal Government, State Agencies, Counties, Cities, Towns, Nonprofit organizations, For-profit organizations

## City and Town Partners

---

- Apache Junction
- Camp Verde
- Cottonwood
- Flagstaff
- Florence
- Payson
- Safford
- Sedona
- Star Valley
- Thatcher
- Tombstone
- Wickenburg
- Winslow
- Yuma

# County Partners

---

- Apache County
- Graham County
- La Paz County
- Santa Cruz County
- Yavapai County

## State Agency Partners

---

- Arizona Department of Corrections
- Arizona Game and Fish Department
- Arizona Department of Transportation – *Arizona Highways*
- Arizona Historical Society
- Arizona Lottery
- Arizona Department of Public Safety
- Arizona Office of Tourism
- Arizona State Land Department

# Government Agency Partners

---

## Federal Partners

- Bureau of Land Management
- National Park Service
- U.S. Forest Service

## Tribal Partners

- Hopi Tribal Council



# Organization & Friends Partners

---

- Arizona Archaeological Society
- Arizona State Parks Foundation
- Benefactors of Red Rock SP
- Friends of Tonto Natural Bridge SP
- Friends of Oracle SP
- Friends of Verde River
- Arizona Heritage Alliance
- Hold the Fort – Fort Verde SP
- Lake Havasu Marine Association
- The Nature Conservancy
- Riordan Action Network
- Sierra Club
- Tombstone Chamber of Commerce
- Tubac Historical Society

# Fundraisers & Private Partners

---

- AAA Arizona
- Arizona State Parks Foundation
- Arizona Highways
- Bashas' Family of Stores
- Dasani
- Odwalla
- Sprouts Farmers Market
- Superstition Harley-Davidson
- Geico

## New Growth

---

- On-line Tour and Camping Reservation System
- Innovative Advertising - Social Media
- Upgraded campgrounds at Lost Dutchman and Patagonia State Parks
- Stabilized Jerome, Tonto and McFarland State Historic Parks and Re-opened
- Working with Private Partners to Enhance Amenities and Services

# Target

---

- Identify & Cultivate State Park Champions
- Coalesce around a strategy for sustainable funding
- Enhance services through concessions
- Diversify / broaden visitor base
- Attendance, Revenue and Operating Efficiencies

# GOAL

---

Need sustainable and sufficient funding for agency

**Vision:** Arizona State Parks is indispensable to the economies, communities, and environments of Arizona.

**Mission:**

Managing and conserving Arizona's natural, cultural and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our Parks and through our Partners.

## Federal Funds

---

Federal Recreational Trails Fund

Federal Historic Preservation Fund

Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund

Other Federal Agreements

# Attachment B

## Definitions of Budget Terms

---

Appropriation - Legislative authorization to expend monies for a specific purpose.

Non-Appropriated Funds - The Board's authority to expend non-appropriated funds is contained in Arizona Revised Statutes.

Fund Offset - An authority designation by the Legislature to use a replacement funding source, typically to replace General Fund monies

Excess Balance Transfer (EBT) - A "Sweep" or a draw from a fund's cash balance to the State's General Fund.

Fund Reduction and Transfer (FRAT) - A reduction of expenditure authority, and in the case of revenue generating funds- with a corresponding cash transfer to the State's General Fund.

Backfill – A legislatively approved mechanism that allows transfer of cash from one ASP fund to another ASP fund in order to comply with a legislated transfer or reduction. Requires State Comptroller & Legislative Approvals.

# Appropriated Funds

---

Enhancement Fund (Gate Fees)

Law Enforcement and Boating  
Safety Fund (LEBSF)

Reservation Surcharge Fund



## Appropriated Funds (Voter Protected)

---

### Land Conservation Fund (Growing Smarter)

- FY 2011 was the final year of the \$20 million appropriation
- Current balance is \$81 M

## Non-Appropriated Funds (Special Funds)

---

- Arizona Trail Fund (last funded in 2009)
- Heritage Fund (eliminated after June 30, 2011)
- Investment Interest
- Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund
- Partnerships Fund
- Publications Fund
- State Parks Donations Fund
- State Lake Improvement Fund

## Federal Funds

---

Federal Recreational Trails Fund

Federal Historic Preservation Fund

Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund

Other Federal Agreements

# Attachment C

## Arizona State Parks Budgets

---

F.1.a

### FY 2012

### Operating Budget

### Assumptions

FY 2012

## Operating Budget –Assumptions

---

Keep State Parks open and operating

No additional fund sweeps in FY 2012

Expend all of LEBSF by the end of FY 2012

FY 2012

## Operating Budget - Assumptions

---

Continued agreements to support park operations

\$1 million allocated for park repair and replacement needs

Operating cash balances will be at historic low levels for the agency

Gradually shift from permanent staffing to more seasonal employees to reduce payroll costs

FY 2012

## Board Policy - Considerations

---

SLIF expenditures greater than annual  
estimated revenue

No Land Conservation Fund Interest  
expenditures in FY2012

FY 2012

## Board Policy - Considerations

---

Reservation Surcharge Fund (RSF) revenues forecasted to be \$500,000 in FY 2012. To be used for new reservation system expansion

Marketing budget to go from \$200,000 to \$400,000 (contract services, no staffing)



FY 2012

## Board Policy - Considerations

---

### Travel Reimbursement

Consider whether travel will be reimbursed in FY2012 for Parks Board members and Advisory Committees

Donations Program – Consider possible expenditures from donation request accounts

Park and Program donation expenditures of \$72,000

Attachment D  
BUDGET

---

F.1.b

FY 2013  
Operating Budget Request  
To OSPB and JLBC  
\$19,617,400

## FY 2013 Operating Budget Request

---

\$10 million appropriation from Enhancement Fund

Remove Kartchner line item

Increased Reservation Surcharge appropriation to  
\$500,000 and remove \$75,000 ending balance cap

LEBSF revenues above \$750,000 for agency  
operations

Moving \$1.12 million of SLIF from Operating to  
Capital

## FY 2013 Operating Budget Assumptions

---

\$1 million allocated for park repair and replacement needs

FY 2013 will start with operating cash balances that are historic low levels

No additional fund sweeps

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS  
AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN 2010  
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES  
Adopted October 20, 2010  
UPDATED APRIL 30, 2011**

**MISSION:** Managing and conserving Arizona's natural, cultural and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our parks and through our partners.

**VISION:** Arizona State Parks is indispensable to the economies, communities and environments of Arizona.

**GOAL:** **Resources**  
To provide sustainable management of our natural, cultural, recreational, economic and human resources.

Objective A. By keeping all parks economically viable and open to the public.

<i>Status</i>	<i>October 2010</i>	<i>April 2011</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Parks Open to Public</i>	79%	89%	+10%
<i>Parks Closed to the Public</i>	21%	11%	-10%
<i>Parks Open Full Time 7 days/week</i>	68%	75%	+7%
<i>Parks Open on Reduced Schedules</i>	11%	14%	+3%
<i>Parks Managed by ASP w/o assistance</i>	32%	32%	
<i>Parks Managed by ASP w/assistance</i>	29%	36%	+7%
<i>Parks Managed by Others</i>	18%	21%	+3%

Objective B. By standardizing and upgrading the information technology infrastructure. *Awarded a contract to provide on-line Internet reservations for Kartchner Caverns tours and also reserved camping sites throughout the camping parks. On-line reservations are currently available at Kartchner Caverns, Dead Horse Ranch, Lake Havasu, Fool Hollow and Cattail Cove State Parks. The first phase of this project will be completed by the end of FY 2011.*



Objective C. By efficiently processing grants, projects, paperwork and documents through the agency.

*Listed 14 properties on the National Register of Historic Places, completed 748 compliance project reviews, and 253 State Property Tax Reviews.*

*Awarded 13 Off Highway Vehicle projects from state and federal funds totaling \$939,700.*

Objective D. By increasing each staff member's knowledge, skills and abilities through training opportunities.

- *Seventy-five percent of supervisors successfully completed the Arizona Learning Center Supervisor Academy.*
- *One hundred percent of law enforcement officers completed AZPOST requirements for Continuing, Proficiency and Firearms training.*
- *Examples of additional training completed by employees are: Bureau of Land Management - the Consensus Institute, Governor's Conference on Tourism, The Best of SCORP, Arizona Summit on Volunteerism, Employment Law, AZ Mature Workforce Initiative, Conflict Management, Water/Wastewater Certification, EMT, CPR instructor, CPR and First Aid, PreHospital CE Training, and Landscape Professional Training, Defensive Driving, and Diversity.*

Objective E. By providing agency staff with a stimulating, safe, and challenging work environment.

*Based on the 2010 Employee Survey, the percentage of employees who agreed with the statement, "I am proud to be an Arizona State Parks employee" increased by 10% from 2009 (74% to 84%).*

**GOAL :      Visitors**

To provide safe, meaningful and unique experiences for our visitors, volunteers and citizens.

Objective A. By working with agency personnel to implement and update the master list of economically feasible facility upgrades that improve the visitor experience and increase revenue.

*Fiscal Year 2011 Capital Funds beginning balance \$7,123,359*

*Percent of Funds spent, per Board approved CIPs, from October – April FY2011 – 38%*

*Percent of Funds spent, per Board approved CIPs, July – April FY2011 – 57.3%*

*Upgrades in progress that improve visitor experience:*

- *Group Use Ramadas-7 parks*
- *Launch Ramp Improvements and Design- 2 parks*
- *Vault type Restrooms – 4 parks*
- *Restroom/Shower Buildings – 2 parks*
- *Campground Electrification – 2 parks*



Objective B. By working with agency personnel to market events and improve the overall quality of existing events.

- *Picacho Peak's "Civil War in the Southwest" hosted more than 3,200 visitors and 200 reenactors (March 12 and 13, 2011).*
- *Homolovi greeted 800 people at its Grand Re-Opening (March 18 and 19, 2011).*
- *The Arizona Archaeology Expo, staffed by 26 archaeological and historical organizations and agencies, hosted over 1,300 visitors (March 26 and 27, 2011).*
- *Fort Verde hosted 414 visitors for History of the Soldier (April 8-10)*
- *The Solar Potluck at Catalina had 150 guests (April 16)*
- *Fool Hollow hosted 280 firefighters and 17 park rangers for a Wildland Firefighter refresher class (April 15-16)*
- *Lake Havasu's April special events included Spring Break (26,000 visitors), the annual Boat Show (6,500) and Desert Storm (900 visitors)*
- *Red Rock hosted 100 people on moonlight hikes in April.*

Objective C. By striving to operate the visitor interface component of the park system with a "cost neutral" budget where visitor revenue equals or exceeds direct visitor costs.

*Underway. State Parks is calculating estimates of all parks' minimum operating costs necessary to meet visitors' requirements and compare these to the unavoidable overhead costs for each state park. [Park Costs with Visitors – Costs of Inactive Park.]*

**GOAL: Planning**

To document our progress through planning, analysis and research.

Objective A. By collecting scientific and historical data on natural and cultural resources to better inform decision-making.

*Continuously. State Parks gathers research data and formats it to be placed in the Park Asset Management System (PAMS) to enhance agency decision-making. Staff will tabulate PAMS updates at the end of each fiscal year.*

Objective B. By updating the long-term Capital Improvement Plan.

*Underway. Capital Improvement Plan to be completed in July.*

Objective C. By continuing to provide accurate, timely, and targeted agency reports on program management and analysis for internal and external use.

*Posted the agency Annual Report on the agency website prior to December 31, 2010.*

*Provide monthly required agency cash flow reports to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budgeting, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and the State Comptroller.*

*Provide monthly individual park and park system attendance and revenue statistics for staff and many interested outside recipients.*



Objective D. By continuing to implement the Revised State Historic Preservation Plan. *Completed National Park Service/Historic Preservation Fund Grant Application. The final appropriation was tied to the approval of the federal budget, which was agreed upon in April 2011.*

**GOAL: Partnerships**

To build lasting public and private partnerships to promote local economies, good neighbors, recreation, conservation, tourism and establish sustainable funding for the agency.

Objective A. By continuing and expanding collaboration with federal, tribal, state, and local governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), concessionaires and private sector individuals whose objectives or duties are similar to State Parks.

- *Established agreements with local governments and non-profit organizations to help keep the following parks open to the public: Alamo Lake, Fort Verde, Homolovi, Jerome, Lost Dutchman, Picacho Peak, Red Rock, Riordan Mansion, Roper Lake, Tonto Natural Bridge, Boyce Thompson Arboretum, McFarland, Tombstone Courthouse, Tubac Presidio, Yuma Territorial Prison, Yuma Quartermaster Depot, and Lyman Lake.*
- *Awarded a fixed price contract for the first phase of an online, web based tour and campground reservation system.*
- *Issued a Request For Proposal for operation of Oracle State Park, but did not receive any responses.*
- *Received six responses to a Request for Information seeking information about what products or services potential, private concessionaires might be interested in providing.*
- *Parks Board approved RFPs for the operation of Lyman State Park and Tonto Bridge State Park were put on temporary hold. The RFPs are expected to be issued in late summer of 2011.*
- *Approved 314 AZSITE (an electronic inventory of archaeological sites, surveys and projects in Arizona) users from 85 organizations. The AZSITE website receives approximately 200 visits per day.*
- *Oversee 654 active Site Stewards monitoring over 1595 sites. This is the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the program.*
- *Approved the first county Certified Local Government - Pima County. Three CLGs were monitored.*

Objective B. By implementing a community relations ~~plan~~ **strategy** that addresses each park's unique location, program audience, and adjacent and thematic communities.

*Implemented strategies with community leaders, friends groups, State Parks Foundation and the media to enhance the visibility of ASP's parks and programs, as well as enhance our working relationships with our partners.*



Objective C. By continuing partnership ~~training~~ awareness/education on agency programs, planning and activities.

*Ongoing. Staff and Parks Board members continuously meet with community groups and trade organizations to educate parties on the benefits of Arizona State Parks and the agency's current financial situation, including:*

- *Rural Legislative Caucus (approximately 25 legislators).*
- *Winslow Chamber of Commerce Annual meeting (150 people)*
- *Greater Association of Mayors (30 people)*
- *Yuma City Council (50 people)*

Objective D. By working with stakeholders to create and promote a strategy for sustainable agency funding.

*Ongoing. Continue to work with stakeholders and leaders to develop and implement a sustainable funding stream.*

**GOAL : Communications**

To effectively communicate with the public, policy makers, our partners, our peers and ourselves.

Objective A. By enhancing the marketing ~~plan~~ strategies.

*Utilize Traditional marketing strategies (e.g. Print, Radio, Internet, Printed Collateral, Out of Home Advertising like the new light-rail posters and photo contest, Outreach Events and Partnerships).*

*Utilize Emerging marketing strategies (e.g. Social Media like Facebook [5,446 fans] and Twitter [3,598 followers], Cell Phone Text messages, and Crowd Source coupons).*

Objective B. By enhancing the public relations plan.

*Ongoing. The public relations plan is a daily document that is updated to reflect activities with the media and support for our partners.*

<i>Visitation</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>(July 2010 – April 2011)</i>	<i>1,820,269</i>	<i>1,534,387</i>	<i>-15.71%</i>

<i>Event attendance:</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Fort Verde SHP – Fort Verde Days (October)</i>	<i>407</i>	<i>799</i>		<i>+96.31%</i>
<i>Jerome SHP – Grand Re-Opening (October)</i>		<i>849</i>		<i>+100%</i>
<i>Kartchner Caverns SP – CaveFest</i>		<i>200</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>+25%</i>

<i>Kartchner Caverns SP – Star Party</i>		<i>200</i>	<i>270</i>	<i>+35%</i>
<i>Verde River Days (September)</i>	<i>3,500</i>	<i>3,100</i>		<i>-11.5%</i>

Objective C. By enhancing agency internal communications including electronic posting of information.

*Based on the 2010 Employee Survey, the percentage of employees who agreed with the statement, "I think communication in the agency has improved in the past 12 months" increased by 6% from 2009 (56% to 62%).*